
Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) assesses the potential environmental effects of the South San Francisco Ferry Terminal Project (Environmental Assessment project), proposed by the San Francisco Bay Area Water Transit Authority (WTA). An EIR is a detailed statement prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is an environmental impact document prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). According to 23 C.F.R 771.119, an EA is a public document which provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an EIS. FTA may require an applicant for financial assistance to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) when the significance of the environmental impact is not clearly established. The project would provide connections to existing and programmed elements of the WTA public water transit system in order to achieve the outlined goals as stated in the Notice of Preparation (NOP). As required by CEQA, this EIR/EA (1) assesses the expected individual and cumulative impacts of the proposed project's physical development; (2) identifies means of avoiding or minimizing potential adverse environmental impacts; and (3) evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project Alternative. In addition, this EIR/EA is a joint document for CEQA and NEPA.

PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The project site includes landside and waterside areas in the East Basin of the Oyster Point Marina Park (Marina). The Marina is about two miles north of San Francisco International Airport and 10 miles south of downtown San Francisco. The Marina is located in the City of South San Francisco along the western shoreline of Central San Francisco Bay. The Marina is directly linked to US 101, almost 1.5 miles from the South San Francisco/ Oyster Point Boulevard exit. The Marina is on the north side of the Oyster Point peninsula.

The Marina is City of South San Francisco land that is leased to the San Mateo County Harbor District and includes 589 slips. Most of the Marina is currently being leased to private parties.¹ The project site is approximately 12 acres, with approximately 4 acres of landside area and 8 acres of waterside area.

At the center of the marina, a 400-foot-long mole divides the east and west basins and is approximately 130 feet wide. The mole contains the Harbormaster's offices. Park lawns are in two separate parcels on the south side and the east end by the 170-foot fishing pier. Mudflats, which provide food and nesting for native and migratory shore birds, are located on the south side of the Oyster Point peninsula. Sierra Point is

directly north of Oyster Point and Point San Bruno is directly south. The San Bruno Mountains are to the northwest, on the west side of US 101.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes construction of a ferry terminal (passenger waiting area, gangway ramp and float), bus terminal, striping for 56 vehicles, and reconfigured circulation and access. About 124 berths, approximately 21 percent of current berths, would be removed to create a path for entering and exiting ferries. This includes all of the slips at Gates 9 and 10, as well as individual slips at the far end of Gates 11, 12 and 13. The occupants of the berths would be relocated to existing vacant berths within the Marina. 3 boats docked at the end of slips which will be altered due to the terminal construction will no longer have spaces in the marina due to the size of their vessel. However, all live aboard vessels will be relocated within the marina and placed in slips in accordance with all rules and regulations which require specific spacing and setbacks. No leases will be broken with the relocation of the vessels as all leases are month-to-month and will be adjusted accordingly.

Dredging under the proposed project would occur at the entrance channel and inner basin area to accommodate ferries. Within the channel and terminal area, dredging would be required to achieve a bottom elevation of -10 feet relative to MLLW, or an average of 3 feet lower than the current bottom elevation. In addition, within the area of the float, dredging would be required to achieve a bottom elevation of -12 feet relative to MLLW. Approximately 17,000 cubic yards of bottom material would be dredged, or about 29 percent of the volume regularly dredged for maintenance (last dredging was 58,000 cubic yards). It is likely that the proposed dredging could be performed using the same dredging and disposal procedures as the past maintenance dredging. Conditions of the past maintenance dredging permit included: documentation requirements, operation outside of the dredging window (December 1 to March 1), and prevention of adverse impacts to tidal marsh or wetlands. Standard dredging environmental control measures, such as silt curtains, would be used during construction to minimize turbidity and reduce potential impacts to sensitive habitat.

It is anticipated that the ferry terminal would be cantilevered from the shoreline. About 250 feet of fixed pier would provide a waiting area for passengers, as well as the entrance to the gangway ramp and float. The fixed pier would be approximately 15 feet to the top of the deck with a 15- to 20-foot canopy above. The float would consist of a “T-shaped” float that could accommodate a ferry boat on either side of the float. The fixed pier would be supported by piles driven or vibrated beyond the landfill cap. The pier, gangway ramp, and float would have canopies. A security gate at the fixed pier would be open during operating hours.

The existing parking area in the project site would be reconfigured to include a 270-foot bus loading/unloading area for four buses, striped parking, pedestrian walkways, and curbs. The existing roundabout would be removed to allow for circulation of incoming traffic on Marina Boulevard traveling

¹ Ten of twelve marina parcels are currently leased. The Assessors Parcel Numbers for the Marina are 015-010-060, 015-010-260, 015-010-270, 015-010-600, 015-190-170, and 015-190-190.

north at about Gate 10, leading to bus unloading or parking access exiting south around the yacht club and back onto Marina Boulevard. As the project site is already impervious surface, new circulation and parking would not add impervious area. The project would connect to existing utilities in the Marina.

The proposed project would connect to the proposed Bay Area Trail, and provide for secure bicycle storage on site, as well as onboard the ferries; thereby increasing bicycle ridership opportunities for commuters using the ferry. The proposed ferry route would carry passengers to and from South San Francisco and the East Bay, either at Harbor Bay, Alameda Point or at Jack London Square. The travel time between South San Francisco and Jack London Square would be 35 minutes, including slow channel passage through the Oakland Estuary, and docking time. The travel time between South San Francisco and Harbor Bay would be 27 minutes. The travel time between South San Francisco and Alameda Point would be 29 minutes.

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS

Based on the initial scoping, the WTA determined that a Draft EIR/EA should be prepared for the proposed project. A summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts for the proposed project is provided in **Table ES-1** at the conclusion of this Executive Summary.

The Draft EIR/EA is considered a “focused” EIR, in which those environmental impact categories identified by the WTA as having “potentially significant” impacts during the notice of preparation, scoping process, and public review period for the Draft EIR/EA are discussed in detail. However, as discussed in Chapter 5, “Other CEQA Considerations,” several specific environmental concerns were found to have no impact, and therefore, are not discussed in this document.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any unavoidable adverse impacts.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative impacts associated with this project have been analyzed by impact area and were considered with other projects located within the East of 101 Area. The project would not result in any significant cumulative impacts.

GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

The proposed ferry terminal would not induce more growth, but would accommodate the population growth in the vicinity that has already occurred and which will continue to occur over time. The proposed project would not induce more growth in the City of South San Francisco but rather allow occupational access for a limited number of people from the east bay. This would have an economic impact on the city but not at a significant level. The project would displace people from other means of transportation such as automobiles or railroads but would still service the same existing South San Francisco worker base.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA requires that an EIR describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts while meeting the basic objectives of the project. The range of alternatives discussed in a Draft EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the identification of only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice between the alternatives and proposed project. The proposed project, SSF Ferry Terminal in the Oyster Point Marina, was selected as environmentally superior to all alternatives.

During preparation of the Draft EIR/EA, WTA considered several alternatives for the project as described below.

■ No-Project Alternative

Assumes the project site would be maintained in its current state. It was considered for its potential to reduce environmental impacts, but deemed infeasible for not achieving any of the project’s objectives, including relieving traffic congestion and related impacts in the Bay Area.

■ Reduced-Project Alternative

This alternative is scaled-down version of the project. It was rejected for failing to meet the project objectives.

■ Alternative Site 1—The Slot

This alternative would involve development of the “Slot” which is located to the east of the project and is shown on Figure 5-1. The site is in the 100-year flood zone, is geologically stable, and developed. This site is unsuitable as it would require a substantial amount of dredging (-9 ft.) on a capped waste landfill.

■ Alternative Site 2—Oyster Point Marina

Alternative site 2 is the project location, and has been evaluated in the main discussion of this EIR/EA

■ Alternative Site 3—Boat Launch Ramp

This alternative would involve development of the project on the public boat launch ramp within the East Basin of the Marina. It is in the 100-year flood zone. The site has recreational uses, but no historic resources. This site is unsuitable as it would infringe on the public access and use of the site as a public boat launch ramp.

■ Alternative Site 4—Fishing Pier

This alternative would involve development of the project on the fishing pier. The fishing pier is located at the end of Oyster Point. Because of its position out into the Bay, the Fishing Pier is sensitive to wind. The site's depth is unknown and may need extensive dredging. This site is unsuitable due to the need to provide a breakwater, provide extensive dredging, and sensitivity to wind conditions.

■ Alternative Site 5.1—Genentech Site 1

This alternative would involve development of the project on the south end of the Genentech campus. Genentech sites have greater exposure to the Bay than other alternative sites and likely would require more dredging and potential construction of a breakwater. Wind conditions would be similar to the Marina. This site is unsuitable due to difficult engineering conditions, as well as increased dredging.

■ Alternative Site 5.2—Genentech Site 2

This alternative would involve development of the project on the lower central portion of the Genentech campus. Genentech sites have greater exposure to the Bay than other alternative sites and likely would require more dredging and potential construction of a breakwater. This site is unsuitable due to difficult engineering conditions, as well as increased dredging.

■ Alternative Site 5.3—Genentech Site 3

This alternative would involve development of the project on the upper central portion of the Genentech campus. Impacts to hazardous conditions would likely be less than within the Marina. Wind conditions would be similar to the Marina. This site is unsuitable since it appears to be a biological restoration site.

■ Alternative Site 5.4—Genentech Site 4

This alternative would involve development of the project on the north end of the Genentech campus on a site used for parking. The site is small, and may have planning restrictions if changed from its current parking use. Wind conditions would be similar to the Marina. This site is unsuitable since it is likely that ferry terminal uses would not be allowed due to planning restrictions, and the site is small.

■ Alternative Site 6—Belle Aire Island

This alternative would involve development of the project on Belle Aire Island, just north of the San Francisco International Airport (SFIA). The site was historically marshlands. It currently has mudflats and is surrounded by ecologically sensitive wetlands. A historic shoreline and historic channel exist at this site. Compared to the Marina site, Belle Aire Island would have more impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, and dredging. Wind considerations would be similar to the marina.

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation <i>LTS – Less Than Significant</i> <i>PS – Potentially Significant</i>	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation <i>LTS – Less Than Significant</i> <i>PS – Potentially Significant</i>
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
Result in the re-suspension of bottom material causing turbidity during vessel maneuvering.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Substantially affect threatened, endangered, or protected species.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alter or diminish designated critical habitat or special aquatic sites, including eelgrass beds, mudflats, and wetlands.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Result in the reduction of protected wetland habitat as defined in Section 404 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> and/or in Section 6610 of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) <i>McAteer-Petris Act</i> or result in alteration of desirable functions and values through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	PS	<p>MM 3.1-4(a) A wetland specialist shall prepare an application for fill of waters subject to the USACE and BCDC’s jurisdiction that would result from construction of the ferry dock and upland facilities. The preferred first step in this process is a pre-application meeting with the applicant and the respective permitting agencies. At this meeting the project can be presented and the appropriate permitting vehicle recommended by the agencies.</p> <p>MM 3.1-4(b) Depending on the results of the pre-application meeting, it may be necessary to develop a comprehensive wetland restoration plan to offset impacts to these resources. Restoration could include on- or off-site enhancement of wetlands, contribution of funds to a local mitigation bank, or restoration of existing yet relatively poor quality wetlands. The USACE goal is to permit no net loss of functions and values of wetland habitat. The replacement ratio of wetland acreage required to achieve this goal is a minimum of 1(new):1(old) but could be higher.</p> <p>MM 3.1-4(c) Dredging permits shall be obtained from the USACE’s DMMO and BCDC as required. Testing of the sediment shall be conducted as required by the DMMO and all dredge materials disposed of accordingly. According to the DMMO dredging cannot occur between December 1 and the end of February to protect aquatic resources without a waiver from CDFG (USACE 2004).</p>	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
Cause the introduction or substantial spread of invasive nonnative plants or wildlife.	PS	MM 3.1-5(a) To prevent further introductions of nonnative cordgrass into the Oyster Point Marina Park (Marina) or the unintentional distribution of cordgrass into other areas of the Bay, all construction equipment, vehicles, and tools shall be thoroughly cleaned before being allowed to enter or leave the project area. Cleaning shall remove all soils, seeds, and plant material. If necessary, coordination with the San Francisco Estuary Institute's Invasive Spartina Project (www.spartina.org) shall occur to determine the most efficient method to prevent an unwanted introduction.	LTS
Interfere substantially with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.	PS	See PEIR Mitigation Measures.	LTS
Cause substantial or sustained impact to spawning habitat of commercially important species (e.g., Pacific herring).	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cause underwater sound pressure levels during construction or operation that exceed NOAA Fisheries guidelines for protection of marine mammals (160 decibels referenced to 1 micropascal).	PS	<p>MM 3.1-8 The WTA shall monitor site-specific conditions during pile driving to ensure that aquatic species would not be impacted and that sound pressure measured outside of the Marina during pile driving would not exceed the 180 dB threshold.</p> <p>Measures could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When creating the final dock design, use fewer or smaller piles and preferably solid piles. ▪ Drive piles with a vibratory device instead of an impact hammer if possible. ▪ Utilize a cushioning block between the hammer head and pile. ▪ Only drive piles during periods of minimal current (slack tide). ▪ If marine mammals are observed within 1,000 feet of the project, allow them to completely exit the project area before pile driving resumes. <p>If piles will be installed during seasons when Chinook or steelhead are in the Bay, restrict pile driving to the June 1 to November 30 work window as recommended by NOAA Fisheries to protect herring and salmonids. Depending on the pile specifics (material, size, hammer, etc) it may be necessary to restrict pile driving to periods of low tide to minimize the in-water portion of the pile and therefore the sound created.</p> <p>If seasonal or tidally-based work restrictions are not feasible, it may be necessary to install an air barrier between the pile and the surrounding water. This approach</p>	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
		effectively disrupts the sound pressure as it travels from water to air then back to water. One way to do this is encase the new piles within a slightly larger hollow pile and pump air into the gap. Alternatively, bubble curtains created by pipes placed on the Marina seabed where the pile enters the ground also effectively disrupt pressure waves.	
WATER RESOURCES			
Would the project involve dredging resulting in a substantial adverse impact on water quality?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project involve dredging that would hinder achievement of the LTMS goals for allocation of dredged materials to in-Bay, ocean, and upland sites?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project adversely affect the safe navigation of the Bay (including commercial shipping), resulting in substantial increases in the number of incidents reported by the VTS?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project interfere substantially with the recreational water uses in San Francisco Bay through increases in the number of accidents involving the interaction of ferries and recreational vessels within the Marina as ferries transit the main east/west channel?	PS	<p>MM 3.2-4(a) Upon permit approval of new ferry service and prior to commencement of new service, the WTA shall ensure that the SMCHD shall conduct the following actions to mitigate navigational safety concerns (Johnson 2005):</p> <p>The breakwater entrance shall be modified to increase vessel visibility during ingress and egress from the Marina by water. Current breakwater design does not allow for direct visual contact of vessel traffic except at the breakwater opening.</p> <p>Signage shall be placed on the breakwater and at key access points to instruct boaters of the potential traffic concerns and wake restrictions. Final wording and locations of signs have not been determined at the time of this EIR/EA.</p> <p>A boating safety and vessel traffic brochure shall be included in all new Marina tenant handouts. The brochures shall also be posted and distributed at the launch ramp.</p> <p>During the initial startup of ferry service and on a regular basis during the most active boating seasons, Harbor Patrol staff shall enter into public outreach educational</p>	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
		<p>programs on the facilities. These outreach programs shall target the active boating public and, specifically, Oyster Point Marina Park (Marina) users.</p> <p>MM 3.2-4(b) The WTA shall ensure that before commencement of ferry operations, monitoring of wave conditions shall be performed to verify adequate design performance and navigation safety within the entrance to the Marina.</p>	
Would the project result in wake wash impacts to adjacent shorelines, biological resources, and small craft?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project result in jet wash impacts on recreational vessels and dock structures adjacent to the berth?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project substantially reduce ability to comply with Central and Lower Bay TMDL discharge limitations?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project result in a post-project pollutant load that is significantly greater than pre-project pollutant load for parameters impairing the Central and Lower Bay (per 303(d) list)?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project result in post-project pollution concentrations significantly greater than Basin Plan water quality objectives?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project result in hydrograph modifications that increase erosive force of water entering a creek, ditch, or other area where erosion and siltation may potentially impact a waterbody?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
Would the project cause degradation in water quality from on-site stormwater discharges due to construction of new terminal facilities, including buildings, roads, parking lots, and associated structures?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project cause substantial flood hazards to human safety and property damage due to construction of new terminal facilities within a floodplain?	PS	MM 3.2-12. The WTA shall comply with Municipal Code flood damage prevention construction standards to minimize damage to development along the Marina shoreline during extreme high tide and storm events.	LTS
Would the project result in substantial increase in the incidence of fuel spills from ferries?	PS	MM 3.2-13 WTA shall prepare a fuel spill prevention and safety plan to reduce the potential for impacts to water resources resulting from implementation of ferry operations at the Marina. The plan shall be updated annually and as necessary (i.e., following a spill event).	LTS
AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH RISK			
Would the project result in substantial localized pollutant emissions that would violate federal or California air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	PS	See PEIR Mitigation Measures. MM 3.3-1(a) The project developer shall require by contract specification that no more than 2 pieces of equipment shall be operated simultaneously within 1000 feet of sensitive receptors. MM 3.3-1(b) The project developer shall require by contract specification that construction equipment be retrofitted with diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts where suitable.	LTS
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as nonattainment under an applicable federal or California ambient air quality standard?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
NOISE AND VIBRATION			
Would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, or for a project within the vicinity of a private air strip?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies?	PS	See PEIR Mitigation Measures.	LTS
Would the project expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project cause substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i> <i>LTS – Less Than Significant</i> <i>PS – Potentially Significant</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i> <i>LTS – Less Than Significant</i> <i>PS – Potentially Significant</i>
Would the project cause substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	PS	<p>MM 3.4-5(a) Notification of nearby property owners and Marina residents of project construction before construction begins. A notification packet will be sent to property owners identifying intended construction schedule, duration of noise-generating construction activities, and a telephone number hotline to use for communicating noise complaints.</p> <p>MM 3.4-5(b) Use appropriate sound-control devices on construction equipment no less effective than those provided by the manufacturer. All equipment will be maintained to minimize noise generation and no equipment will have unmuffled exhausts.</p> <p>MM 3.4-5(c) To minimize effects of pile driving on nearby residents, WTA will restrict pile driving to between the hours of 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. to ensure that driving occurs when residents are more likely to be away from home or able to leave if necessary to avoid noise effects.</p> <p>MM 3.4-5(d) The WTA will ensure the contractor will use the best available technology to minimize noise from pile driving.</p>	LTS
Would the project expose residents and noise-sensitive land use to “impacts” as defined by the Federal Transit Administration?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project expose terrestrial wildlife to 60 A-weighted dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (or greater) per the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project expose aquatic wildlife to underwater sound pressure levels at or above 160 dB, the National Marine Fisheries Service?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
Would the project expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, subsidence, uplift, erosion, expansive soils, tsunami, or seiche?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project expose people or structures to on-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, ground subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse because terminals were situated on unstable geologic units or soil, or soil that could become unstable as a result of the project?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project prevent future access to geologic features and resources of economic or scientific value?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project impact shoreline stability, subsidence, dredged material placement feasibility or the peninsula where the terminal would be situated?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strong seismic groundshaking? ▪ Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction 	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	PS	<p>PR 3.6A The WTA shall submit a development proposal to the RWQCB in accordance with order No. 00-046 issued June 21, 2000. The order imposes new closure and post-closure requirements on the City of South San Francisco as part of future development.</p> <p>PR 3.6B The project shall be designed in accordance with guidelines set forth in the Post-Closure Development Standards Report as well as applicable local, state, and federal requirements.</p>	LTS
Would the project expose people to contaminants in soil, groundwater, or structures?	PS	<p>MM 3.6-3(a) Prior to issuance of building permits, the WTA shall perform an assessment of potential excess loading of the waste and infiltration reduction to ensure that problematic increases in leachate levels do not occur.</p> <p>MM 3.6-3(b) The WTA shall be responsible for obtaining focused soil gas sampling in areas that are to be disturbed during construction of the proposed project and structural gas control measures will be required to prevent accumulation of potentially explosive concentrations in structures and migration of methane gas to the adjacent property.</p>	LTS
ENERGY			
Would implementation of the project place substantial demand on regional energy supply?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would implementation of the project lead to a wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary usage of energy?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	Oyster Point Boulevard/Gateway Boulevard: LTS Dubuque Avenue/Oyster Point Boulevard: LTS US 101 southbound study segments: LTS	No mitigation is required.	Oyster Point Boulevard/Gateway Boulevard: LTS Dubuque Avenue/Oyster Point Boulevard: LTS US 101 southbound study segments: LTS
Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?	South San Francisco: LTS East Bay: PS	See PEIR Mitigation Measures.	South San Francisco: LTS East Bay: LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i> LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
Would the project conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	Bicycle and Pedestrian: LTS Transit Services: LTS	No mitigation is required.	Bicycle and Pedestrian: LTS Transit Services: LTS
LAND USE, PLANS, AND POLICIES			
Would the proposed project cause community displacement resulting in the displacement of existing houses or businesses, either directly or indirectly?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Result in disproportionate physical impacts to low-income or minority communities.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES			
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the proposed project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Ferry Service: LTS Construction: PS	MM 3.10-1 During construction, the project contractor shall ensure collection of all construction debris along with daily disposal, or, if daily disposal is not practical, visually screen the debris from public view. The construction site shall be left in a clean, orderly condition at the end of each work day.	Ferry Service: LTS Construction: LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
Would the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the proposed project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	PS	See PEIR Mitigation Measures.	LTS
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in the NRHP criteria and/or CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 36 CFR 60.4 Criterion (d) and/or CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	PS	<p>MM 3.11-2 A qualified archaeologist approved by the WTA shall first determine whether a previously unidentified archaeological resource uncovered during construction is a “unique archaeological resource” under 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5, and/or Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. If the archaeological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource,” the archaeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan that satisfies the requirements of, 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5, and/or Public Resources Code 21083.2. Work in the vicinity of the find may resume at the completion of a mitigation plan or recovery of the resource.</p> <p>If the archaeologist determines that the archaeological resource is not a unique archaeological resource, work will resume, and the archaeologist may record the site and submit the recordation form to the California Historic Resources Information System Northwest Information Center.</p> <p>The archaeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the California Historic Resources Information System Northwest Information Center.</p>	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature pursuant to 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5 and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries pursuant to 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5 and/or Public Resources Code Section 5097.98?	PS	MM 3.11-4 In the event of the discovery of a burial, human bone, or suspected human bone, all excavation or grading in the vicinity of 100 feet of the find shall halt immediately, the area of the find shall be protected, and the WTA immediately shall notify the San Mateo County Coroner of the find and comply with the provisions of PRC Section 5097 with respect to Native American involvement, burial treatment, and re-burial, if necessary. Work may resume once the area is protected or the body is removed.	LTS
SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION (NEPA)			
Would the project acquire land for use as a result of the proposed improvements under the project?	No Impact	No mitigation measures identified	No Impact
Would there be temporary use of the Bay Trail right-of-way during construction?	PS	See Mitigation Measures MM3-4.5(a-d) and MM3-10.1	LTS
Would there be improvements that would be located directly adjacent to the Bay Trail causing construction related effects? Would the new ferry service result in new operational effects?	Construction: PS Operational: LTS	See Mitigation Measures MM3-4.5(a-d) and MM3-10.1	Construction: LTS Operational: LTS
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (NEPA)			
Would the project result in disproportionate effects on an environmental justice community as defined by Executive Order No. 12898?	No disproportionate effects	No mitigation measures identified	No disproportionate effects

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation LTS – Less Than Significant PS – Potentially Significant
POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING, INCLUDING GROWTH INDUCEMENT			
Would the project induce substantial population growth in the project site either directly or indirectly?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES			
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection or emergency services?	PS	Improvement Measure 3.15-2 The WTA shall create an Emergency Response Plan for emergencies on the water. Specifically, the WTA shall collaborate with the SSFFD, U.S. Coast Guard, Harbormaster, and the SFO Fire Marshal to create an emergency response plan for implementation in the event a water-based emergency were to occur during construction and/or project operations. The Emergency Response Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the identification of appropriate agencies and their associated responsibilities during a water-based emergency; standard operational procedures to detail how their assigned responsibilities will be performed to support implementation of the plan; circumstances under which emergency authorities would become effective; arrangements for the provision of direction and control during an emergency; etc.	LTS
Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i> <i>LTS – Less Than Significant</i> <i>PS – Potentially Significant</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i> <i>LTS – Less Than Significant</i> <i>PS – Potentially Significant</i>
Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS